DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 510 EA 018 310

AUTHOR Acheson, Keith A.; Smith, Stuart C.
TITLE It Is Time for Principals to Share the Responsibility for Instructional Leadership with Others.
INSTITUTION Oregon School Study Council, Eugene.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 30p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, OR 97403 ($4.00 prepaid; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
JOURNAL CIT OSSC Bulletin; v29 n6 Feb 1986

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Development; Instructor Coordinators; Leadership; Peer Evaluation; *Principals; School Administration; *School Supervision; Supervisor Qualifications; Supervisory Training; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Instructional Leadership

ABSTRACT

Instructional leadership is leadership that is directly related to the processes of instruction where teachers, learners, and the curriculum interact. These three elements constitute the domains of the instructional process. The principal alone often cannot be effective in the supervisory role because of lack of time, lack of specific training and expertise in the techniques of supervision, and the tension caused by the fact that the principal is usually the evaluator as well as the supervisor of teachers. The supervisory role could be carried out more effectively if the evaluation and supervision functions were separated and if principals were given training and experience in systematic observation and feedback techniques. The principal would provide formal evaluation for summative purposes while teachers would be trained to observe one another and to provide feedback for formative purposes as part of the staff development program. Other instructional leadership roles would be assigned to department heads, teaching colleagues, project directors, computer coordinators and program developers, and other administrators. Supplementary resources that could be tapped include students, self-analysis, support groups, referrals, and plans of assistance. In this way, principals could assume important new roles in such areas as inservice training, staff development, and probationary teacher work. (GJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267510

It Is Time for Principals to Share the Responsibility for Instructional Leadership with Others

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. K. Piele

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Keith A. Acheson
with Stuart C. Smith

EA 018 310

February 1986
Vol. 29, No. 6

Prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management

OSSC BULLETIN

OSSC BULLETIN

It Is Time for Principals to Share the Responsibility for Instructional Leadership with Others

Keith A. Acheson
with Stuart C. Smith

February 1986
Vol. 29, No. 6

Oregon School Study Council

ISSN 0095-6694
Individual Copy $4.00
Quantity Discounts:
10-24 copies - 15%
25-49 copies - 20%
50 + copies - 25%

Oregon School Study Council
1787 Agate Street
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
(503) 686-5045

The University of Oregon is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer

Preface

At one of the recent series of task force hearings held by the National Governors' Association, Chester E. Finn, Jr., assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, surprised his audience when he presented some novel ideas about the role of the school principal. As reported by *Education Week* (January 8, 1986), Finn said it is more important that principals act like business executives--making "the whole institution operate effectively"--than that they be instructional leaders. Where would instructional leaders come from? A revitalized teaching profession would produce them, he said.

The school effectiveness research has demonstrated convincingly that effective schools begin with effective principals. But not all principals possess the necessary range of managerial, human relations, and instructional leadership competencies to lead their schools in ways suggested by this research, nor do they have the time to perform all these functions in an exemplary manner. Based on his years of research and direct personal contact with hundreds of principals and their teachers, Keith Acheson is convinced that many principals are unable to provide quality instructional leadership in their schools.

Like Finn, Acheson believes it is time to redefine the roles of principal and teacher. In Acheson's view, teachers could perform observation-and-feedback (the formative phase of evaluation) on one another, while principals or other administrators retain responsibility for making personnel decisions (the summative phase). Dr. Acheson and OSSC welcome your response to the ideas contained in this essay.

This Bulletin is a cooperative publication of the Oregon School Study Council and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, which commissioned Dr. Acheson to write the material. Acheson is associate director of the Clearinghouse as well as a professor of education in the University of Oregon's College of Education, Division of Teacher Education. He is coauthor, with Meredith D. Gall, of *Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications* (Longman, revised edition forthcoming). The April 1985 OSSC Bulletin featured his essay on *The Principal's Role in Instructional Leadership.*

Stuart C. Smith is director of publications and editor, respectively, of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management and the Oregon School Study Council.

Philip K. Piele
Executive Secretary

About ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the U.S. Department of Education. ERIC serves educators by disseminating research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research results and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, monographs, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

This issue of the OSSC Bulletin was prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education under contract number 400-83-0013. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Department of Education or the Clearinghouse.

Contents

Preface iii

About ERIC v

Introduction 1

The Role of the Instructional Leader 3

Domains of the Instructional Process 3
Summary 6

Why the Principal Alone Cannot Carry Out This Role 7

Limitations on the Principal's Role as Clinical Supervisor 8
A More Promising Approach: Separate the Two Roles 10

Principals Can Share the Role with Others 12

Some Potential Instructional Leaders 12
A New Role for the Principal 18

Conclusion 20

References 21

Introduction

Currently, the instructional leader in a school is perceived to be the principal. Moreover, when principals are surveyed, they list instructional leadership as their most important role. The other demands on their time, however, usually relegate active leadership of the instructional program to a minor role.

The purpose of this Bulletin is to suggest some alternative models that would allow principals to share the responsibility of instructional leadership with others. To do this we shall first define the functions of instructional leadership and then consider whether other personnel in the schools can assist the principal in carrying out these functions.

Several forces are propelling us toward creating new roles in the schools for instructional leaders. One is the increased role conflict felt by building principals who are expected to be hard-nosed evaluators of teachers and also kindly, sympathetic, helpful supervisors of instruction. Another pressure comes from task forces and special commissions who recommend career ladders for teachers along with other incentives and rewards to stimulate and improve the performance of the schools.

Some momentum is developing within the profession through teachers' organizations that are promoting more careful screening at entry levels, more support and better staff development opportunities for inservice teachers, and better on-the-job supervision. Tougher teacher evaluation laws emphasize the need for better programs of assistance for teachers with serious deficiencies. These laws also specify fair dismissal procedures, when necessary.

Perhaps the most important reason to look for alternative sources of instructional leadership is that traditional arrangements are, in many cases, not getting the job done adequately.

In many schools, the functions of supervision are not being carried out well. Teachers are not observed regularly or systematically, nor are they provided with insightful feedback they can use to improve instruction or increase effectiveness. A key

factor is lack of time by supervisors who have many other duties. Other reasons that the functions of instructional leadership are not being performed well are:

- lack of knowledge of a range of observational techniques by supervisors and other observers
- lack of understanding of a variety of instructional strategies by teachers and supervisors
- lack of interpersonal skills used by observers in providing feedback to teachers

If others besides the principal are to take part in supervision, evaluation, and improvement of instruction, then we first need to consider what instructional leadership is all about. Accordingly, chapter 1 looks at the instructional leader's role in terms of the domains of the instructional process.

With the role of an instructional leader thus defined, chapter 2 discusses reasons why the school principal acting alone cannot adequately fulfill the responsibilities of an instructional leader. Chapter 3 considers the benefits of sharing these responsibilities with other personnel.

The Role of the Instructional Leader

Surveys of school principals repeatedly show that they regard the role of instructional leader to be their major responsibility. However, the unclear nature of that role and the many conflicting demands on the principal's time often force the role into the background.

Because of this lack of clarity, any discussion of what an instructional leader is or does must begin with some definitions. *Instructional leadership* is leadership that is directly related to the processes of instruction where teachers, learners, and the curriculum interact. These three elements constitute the domains of the instructional process.

Domains of the Instructional Process

To exert leadership over this process, the principal or other leader must deal with--in the case of teachers--supervision, evaluation, staff development, and inservice training. In relationship to students, the areas of achievement, testing, and discipline will be of concern. In governing the content of instruction, that is, the curriculum, the instructional leader will oversee materials selection and exercise choices in scope and sequence, unit construction, and design of activities.

Now we may ask, "What does a person do while being the leader of all these things?" In a single morning we might observe a principal talking to one or more students who have been sent to the office for disciplinary purposes, writing a memo to teachers about standardized tests that will be administered next week, observing a lesson, holding a conference with a teacher, meeting with a curriculum committee that is considering the adoption of a new social studies program, and placing an order for some new maps. All these activities fall within our definition.

We might also observe the principal dealing with the inoculation program, the dad's club which wants lights on the tennis courts, the cook who wants a microwave oven, the contractor who is paving the parking lot, the salesman who has a new kind of floor

wax, and countless other duties that fall outside our definition. It is often easier to postpone the observation of a lesson than to keep the dads' club waiting or the contractor who has a steamroller parked at the door. It is also tempting to deal with tangibles such as microwave ovens and floor wax rather than the controversies and complexities of the curriculum.

To gain a clearer idea of what can properly be considered instructional leadership, let us take a closer look at the leader's role in regard to each of the three major domains of the instructional process in turn--teachers, students, and content.

Teachers

Supervision and evaluation are the two activities that are most important to the instructional leader in dealing with teachers. Related topics are recruitment, selection, staff development, inservice training, assignment, dismissal, and due process.

Supervision of teachers is moving from the inspector's role to that of a friendly critic or collegial observer. The role of friendly critic (or critical friend) is particularly appropriate when teachers supervise one another.

Most writers and researchers see a need for several stages in the supervisory cycle, including preobservation conference and preparation, a range of observational techniques and data collecting devices, and postobservation analysis and conference along with followup activities.

Evaluation of teachers involves these same activities, but, in addition, can include the setting of teacher goals by the teacher and the instructional leader. The goals, if they are to be used as a basis for evaluation, must be consistent with the school district's standards of competent performance and the official job description for the position being evaluated. In addition to knowing the district standards, the evaluator needs to know the criteria of teacher effectiveness that have been identified through research. Another aspect of evaluation has evolved: the need to design programs of assistance for teachers who have serious deficiencies. One of the rights of due process for tenured teachers is the opportunity to correct unsatisfactory performance.

The instructional leader must develop several skills and areas of knowledge to be effective in supervision and evaluation. One is an understanding of a range of models or strategies of teaching to be able to observe and analyze different kinds of teaching intelligently. Another is a repertoire of observation techniques and data collection devices so there is something tangible and

appropriate to analyze. Certain interpersonal skills are indispensable if the planning, observing, and feedback are to be effective. Teachers are often highly sensitive and threatened by the supervision/evaluation process.

Students

Although we think of students as the clients of teachers and teachers as the clients of supervisors, the instructional leader also has students as his or her ultimate clients. For example, an elementary school principal sits with each child in the school twice a year and listens to them read a story of their choosing. Similar activities in writing and math bring the instructional leader into direct contact with the recipients of the instructional program.

In addition to information about achievement, the leader needs to know about aptitude, motivation, attitudes, interests, and values. He or she needs to see student work as well as test scores. In recording and analyzing interaction in the classroom, the observer needs to be perceptive of the students' part in that dialogue as well as the teacher's.

Content

We educators have not exerted strong leadership in the selection and presentation of the content of instruction. We have tended to leave this task to the writers and publishers of textbooks. One indication that this trust may have been misplaced is the discovery that the content of standardized tests and standard texts--even those produced by the same publisher--may not overlap significantly. Another indication of lack of leadership or misplaced trust is the case of a Canadian social studies teacher who based his view of history on a belief in an international conspiracy and had students read only material sympathetic to that view.

Now one may reasonably ask if the principal, as instructional leader, is expected to be expert in all the subjects and all the grade levels of the curriculum. Obviously, he or she cannot have a specialist's knowledge in each of the fields, but a general knowledge seems reasonable. A baseball manager may not know as much about pitching as the pitching coach or as much about batting as the batting coach, but he had better understand pitching and batting pretty well to survive as the "instructional leader" of the club. We no doubt need educational equivalents of batting coaches and pitching coaches, also. (It is worth noting baseball managers have business managers and public relations specialists; principals usually do not.)

Another aspect of the content of instruction that must fall to the leader is the relationship of the parts to the whole. The balance among the various subjects, topics, and objectives must be the concern of someone with the "big picture" in mind. When we hear charges of "too much emphasis on athletics" or "not enough Humanities," we assume someone has the authority to change the balance.

Intersections

Thus far we have defined the role of instructional leader in three broad areas as if they were separate, but of course they are not. They intersect and interact with each other in a number of ways. During actual classroom instruction all three--teacher, students, and content--interact simultaneously. In independent study or in computer-assisted learning, students may interact with content apart from the teacher. In lesson preparation, a teacher interacts with content apart from students.

It is interesting to note that we prepare teachers by having them learn about students in courses such as child development and educational psychology. They learn content in courses such as history or mathematics and presumably find out about being a teacher in methodology courses. Then we toss them into the cauldron of practice teaching to put it all together. Fortunately, some enlightened programs are beginning to mix the parts earlier and with a more holistic view.

Considering the leader's domains two at a time sheds light on some activities that may become a part of the role. For example, teachers and content are the concern of a leader who wants to promote a curriculum innovation. Teachers and students become the focus when the concern is interpersonal communication skills. Students and content come to the fore when college preparatory programs are being modified.

Summary

We have defined instructional leadership from the standpoint of the things and people with whom the leader works: teachers, students, instructional content. In the light of this discussion, let us now turn our attention to the possibility of the principal sharing these responsibilities with others. First we must consider why such sharing is necessary.

Why the Principal Alone Cannot Carry Out This Role

Over the years we have been involved in a number of studies to find out what kind of supervisory leadership teachers are actually getting and what kind they would prefer. There is abundant evidence that teachers do not like to be supervised and evaluated in the ways that are most commonly used. These inquiries have been limited to those leadership behaviors that pertain to the planning, observing, and feedback stages of direct teacher supervision. The suspicion with which many teachers view evaluation is often justified. Blumberg (1974) calls it a cold war.

These studies lead us to conclude that most supervisors/evaluators do the minimum number of observations expected of them. In jurisdictions where teachers are only required to be evaluated every three or five years, that is as often as they are observed. If the law specifies multiple observations yearly, teachers tend to be observed twice a year.

In general, what we have found is that teachers want an instructional leader who will meet with them individually, discuss *their* concerns, help select appropriate ways to collect data from observation and other means, cooperatively analyze the data, and consider alternatives. They want a colleague who is skilled at observation, knowledgeable about teaching, and supportive.

Of Broudy's three kinds of teaching--heuristics, didactics, and philetics--the third approach comes closest to what these teachers seem to be seeking. It is a mentor model characterized by positive regard, individualized guidance, and strong dependence on the nature of the relationship: Horace Mann at one end of the log and me at the other.

Few school leaders would deny the reasonableness of these teacher preferences. The kind of instructional leadership teachers say they prefer is also what a broad range of research findings say they should be receiving. Studies of "coaching" with teachers, for example, have underlined the need for consistent followup by trainers or supervisors on the practice of new skills (Showers 1985 and Joyce and Showers 1982).

Despite apparent near unanimity on what should be the ideal state of supervisory practice, it has not yet become reality except in isolated instances. What stands in the way? The chief obstacle may well be the traditional model whereby supervision and evaluation are exercised by only one person in the school: the principal. Several limitations on the principal's role serve to stifle his or her ability to carry out the full range of supervisory responsibilities.

Limitations on the Principal's Role as Clinical Supervisor

In most schools, the person charged with the responsibility for supervising teachers is the principal. Three things have inhibited the discharge of this responsibility: lack of time, lack of specific training and expertise in the techniques of supervision, and the tension caused by the fact that the principal is usually the evaluator as well as the supervisor of teachers.

Time

If clinical supervision is to be effective in helping teachers to analyze and improve their teaching, then several complete cycles should take place within the school year. Each cycle will include a preobservation conference, an observation in which data are systematically collected, and a postobservation conference in which data are shared and analyzed. Each phase of the cycle may take from twenty to thirty minutes. Allowing time for preparing each phase, a cycle may average two hours. Six cycles per teacher is a reasonable number, hence twelve hours per teacher is the magnitude of investment we are considering.

Specific Training and Expertise

A clinical supervisor needs several kinds of knowledge and skill to be effective. Knowledge of a range of observation recording systems is essential. Practice in using these systems is also necessary if the supervisor is to have the skill required to record useful data. Understanding of a wide range of teaching strategies or models is also needed if one is to work effectively with a variety of teachers working in different situations.

Interpersonal skills of a high order are also called for if productive conferences are to take place. Teachers are protective, defensive, and anxious about discussing their teaching. A supervisor needs to be able to build a high level of trust and still accomplish desirable changes of behavior by the teacher. When the principal serves as both evaluator and supervisor, establishing trust is especially difficult.

When evaluation is part of the responsibility, several other kinds of knowledge are needed. One must know the district policies and applicable laws governing employment practices and due process. An understanding of what constitutes effective teaching (as verified by research findings and required by district standards of competent performance) will also be expected of the supervisor who evaluates the performance of others. Skill in documenting is essential in those cases that may end in dismissal.

Our experience in the field with administrator inservice programs indicates that many principals lack the level of knowledge and skill that would make them effective clinical supervisors. Surveys of teachers in several countries substantiate this conclusion.

Evaluation vs. Supervision

One of the most persistent problems in supervision is the dilemma between (a) evaluating a teacher in order to make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure and (b) working with the teacher as a friendly critic or colleague to help develop skills the teacher wants to use and to expand the repertoire of strategies that can be employed.

We have struggled for many years with the tension that results from these different purposes for observation, feedback, goal setting, planning, and the other activities of clinical supervision. In some respects the two outcomes, evaluation and help, are compatible. Many jobs combine the two functions. For example, the vice principal of a school may be in charge of student counseling and discipline. Of course, students who are called to the office may be apprehensive about whether they will receive therapy or be expelled. Parents are both evaluators and disciplinarians and at the same time supervisors and counselors. Some parents, and some administrators, handle this double agent role gracefully and convincingly (though we never did believe them when they said, "This is going to hurt me more than you.")

Supervising and evaluating teachers demands an especially delicate balance. Effective supervision requires a high level of trust. Teachers often regard any evaluation that is less than laudatory as an attack on their character. To evaluate them as teachers is to evaluate them as persons. It is difficult to trust someone who is (in your mind) slandering and defaming your heart and soul.

Of course, if all evaluators had the knowledge and skill that have been described, then the tension would be reduced. If principals had the time (or would take the time) to make more than

one or two observations for a summative evaluation, then the possibilities for formative, growth-oriented activities would be enhanced and teachers might lose some of the apprehension they have about supervision.

Another way to reconcile the tension between supervision and evaluation is to agree that both are for the same ultimate purpose--the improvement of instruction. All instructors can improve. Some have only growth needs; some also have deficiency needs; some have intensive needs; a few have desperate needs.

A More Promising Approach: Separate the Two Roles

Although some principals are able to balance the roles of supervisor and evaluator effectively, many more cannot. This tension and the problems of limited time and insufficient expertise to supervise teachers mentioned above lead us to conclude that it would be best to separate the role of clinical supervisor or helpful colleague from the role of evaluator. We may label the functions of the former as "formative" and the latter as "summative."

We propose that someone other than the evaluator should plan with and observe teachers and provide feedback strictly for the purpose of improvement. The evaluator's observations will be for the purpose of writing a formal, summative assessment of the teacher. Data or other documentation from the formative phase will only be used at the request of the teacher.

One implication of separating the two functions is that many schools will have to adapt to some new roles. Currently schools are accustomed to having administrators as supervisors and evaluators. Our new formative friends, by contrast, would be colleagues--other teachers, department heads, team leaders, "mentors"--not line administrators.

A second implication is that these collegial observers will need certain skills and understanding in order to fulfill their new roles effectively. Many of the skills (or techniques) that an effective collegial observer needs are the same as those of a clinical supervisor that have been described in the previous chapter. Depending on the role that is developed in various situations, the instructional leader who is not an administrator may need additional skills and training. We shall explore some of these possibilities in the next chapter.

A third implication of creating new roles for teachers is that the role of the administrator will need to change with, adapt to, and complement the new roles that teachers will play. Therefore, as well as considering some new roles that teachers will play, we

shall also consider some new roles that principals or other administrators might play.

The development of new roles of instructional leadership to provide the formative, developmental improvement of teaching that supervision should provide has several advantages. One is the likelihood that teachers will respond more positively to a new kind of leadership. These new roles can also provide a career ladder for teachers who do not wish to become administrators yet do wish to advance in the profession.

If successfully implemented, such a program could be cost-beneficial. Two examples may illustrate the point. In one case litigation brought by a teacher cost nearly a quarter of a million dollars in attorney fees alone; in another a reinstated teacher became a nonproductive liability that, over the years, may have cost a half million dollars in salary, administrative time, legal fees, and the like. If these cases had been worked out cooperatively by the school districts and teacher associations rather than as a labor/management confrontation, those same funds could have bought a lot of inservice training or released time for collegial supervision. Effective collegial leadership would serve as a preventative in such cases as opposed to the much more costly remedies of litigation.

What role might a teachers' organization play in bringing to life a new form of instructional leadership? Perhaps this approach can provide a means for teacher organizations to play a positive role in the improvement of competence within the profession. Taking a union model, we might consider a shop steward who not only looks out for the rights of the members but also serves a quality control function. Such a person might use the techniques of clinical supervision to provide assistance to members in need of help.

Another possibility is training. Again using a union model, progressing from apprentice to journeyman to master involves intensive on-the-job training and experience under close supervision. The teacher association might play a role in providing this training.

Principals Can Share the Role with Others

Because principals have so many roles to fill and severe limitations on their ability to carry out those roles, we believe it is reasonable to expect that they might share some of their responsibilities with other personnel.

In this chapter we describe instructional leadership responsibilities that already have been assumed or potentially could be assumed by existing personnel who fill traditional roles in the schools. We also consider some changes in the principal's role that might result from a shift of instructional leadership responsibilities to these other personnel.

Some Potential Instructional Leaders

Some aspects of instructional leadership are already shared by a variety of personnel in many schools. Department heads in high schools have traditionally been responsible for concerns that are specific to the subject matter. Elementary schools that are organized into units often have a team leader for each of the units.

In large schools the supervision and evaluation responsibilities often are shared with other administrators. Many of the management functions can also be delegated. The resource that is least often drawn upon is teachers, who can provide observation, feedback, psychological support, and expert analysis for their colleagues.

Department Heads

Perhaps the most familiar other instructional leader is the department head in a large high school. These individuals perform a number of different functions depending upon the policies in the various schools. Some are in charge of the budget for a department such as English or science or mathematics. Quite often it is the department head who calls regular meetings of the department members to talk about curriculum matters and day-to-day operation

of the school program. Probably many of these meetings have been devoted to administrative matters rather than instructional or curriculum concerns.

In some large high schools department heads may actually visit classes, take part in evaluating teachers, and act as a supervisor or mentor for teachers in the department. These functions may be the closest we can find to describing what tangible instructional leadership looks like.

Elementary schools usually do not have department heads, though in recent years the multiunit school and similar organizational arrangements have created some roles with similar functions. In many elementary schools, however, the principal is the designated leader of instruction and must supervise and evaluate the teachers, keep an eye on the curriculum and the methodologies of teaching, as well as tend to all the managerial functions such as budgets, school lunch programs, nursing, inoculations, safety, buses, sports, plays, concerts, PTA, and community relations.

Department heads have the advantage of being subject matter specialists in their field. Thus they avoid the skepticism principals often receive--"How can a former math teacher supervise and evaluate a foreign language teacher?" Department heads are also concerned about, and in immediate contact with, the curriculum in their department. However, they have often shied away from assuming responsibilities for supervising teachers or making major decisions about the curriculum. A redefinition of the role and provision for relevant training are needed to make department heads true instructional leaders.

What might a department head hope to accomplish by taking on a new role as instructional leader? To answer the question let's imagine a possible case. Pat is head of a high school mathematics department and receives a stipend plus a free period each day for carrying out the tasks of the assignment. Pat has received training and has skills in observing and analyzing teaching and giving feedback to the seven department members. Some of them have similar skills, so sometimes Pat takes their classes while they observe a colleague. At least ten observations are made each month so each teacher (including Pat) has six to eight per year. These are regarded as formative by the teachers, who choose goals to work on that are consistent with their own growth needs and concerns.

In addition to the personal growth that these teachers achieve, there are some spinoffs. Because they observe in one another's classes, there is a coherence to the program. They know what others are doing and can articulate sequences of courses and activities. They have a mutual sense of psychological and professional support. They share teaching ideas, and when

curriculum is being modified they analyze the effects at a concrete level. They have overcome their apprehension about videotaping their own teaching for self-analysis. The students are also accustomed to having observers and recorders in the room.

One can see the effects of Pat's leadership (and the cooperation of colleagues) in morale, school climate, student achievement, and job satisfaction.

If department heads are to assume greater responsibility as instructional leaders, several other changes may need to occur. There should be prerequisite training in supervision skills and curriculum matters. Most incumbents will need more time for classroom visits than they now have. There also should be a proportionate increase in authority to accompany any increase in responsibility. For example, the department head might have the authority to change teaching assignments, allocate materials, modify curriculum, and establish testing programs. We do not recommend that department heads write formal evaluations of their fellow teachers because of the strain this would place on the trust relationship.

Teaching Colleagues

Experiments with team teaching may not have proved that it increases achievement by students, but these studies did show that teachers can benefit from working closely with colleagues. In a team, teachers vicariously pick up teaching techniques from one another and are exposed to an expanded repertoire of strategies. If teachers were trained in systematic observation procedures, they would be the ideal persons to provide feedback to one another.

Collegial supervision may well be the next logical step for the schools to take. Viewed from a historical perspective, education has tended to move from an inspector model of employee monitoring to a more democratic, collaborating one. The participation of the teacher in setting goals for self-improvement, choosing sources of feedback, and making decisions about desirable changes has received increased attention over the years. The responses to surveys of teachers and supervisors in several countries have indicated that this is the kind of supervision teachers (and many supervisors) are seeking.

If we are really serious about increasing the quantity and quality of supervision in schools, the most available source of manpower and expertise is teachers themselves. They can analyze their own teaching on the basis of objective data, observe in one another's classrooms and record data teachers cannot record for themselves, and help one another analyze these data and make decisions about alternative strategies.

Teachers and their professional organizations are understandably opposed to becoming evaluators of other teachers, but they are usually enthusiastic when given responsibilities for staff development. In our scenario the principal (or other responsible administrator) will still do the formal evaluation. Evaluators, too, need the skills and techniques of clinical supervision, but here we are considering what part teachers can, and should, play. Teachers can perform all the collegial tasks described above without becoming evaluators.

To make use of the talents and skills of teachers, some adjustments need to be made to allow and encourage them to observe in one another's classrooms and to have time to meet and discuss what they have observed. Collegial supervision also has implications for inservice training: teachers must develop the skills of systematic observation and helpful feedback.

Creating instructional leadership roles for teachers requires some imagination. For one thing, teachers in this role will need a label or title. We also need to define the functions. For example, we might call them *master teachers* and place them in charge of new teachers, student teachers, and teacher aides in addition to setting a minimum number of classroom observations and conferences with each of several other teachers. Other possible functions might have to do with curriculum, counseling, testing, and the like. California has begun to use "mentor teachers" to fulfill this kind of a role.

Project Directors

Another kind of instructional leadership has emerged in recent years. It came into being with the advent of federally supported projects in schools. A project director often takes on instructional leadership responsibilities in order to get the mission of the project accomplished.

The project directorship has often been a stepping stone in the career of a person who moves on to other instructional leadership roles. It is interesting to note that a number of people who would not have chosen to go into administration have (through such federal programs as the Teacher Corps) taken positions of leadership as it affects the instructional program with the consequent shift to administrative responsibility.

These persons have often had an evangelistic zeal for a new kind of curriculum, a new kind of methodology, or a special interest in certain types of students. They tend not to be predominantly interested in managerial administrative tasks. Some of these people have moved into central office positions in larger school districts and have taken on a role similar to one that was

formerly occupied by persons called subject matter supervisors. Those jobs have often been phased out because of changes in organization and emphasis on reduced budgets.

Computer Coordinators and Program Developers

As the use of computers and microcomputers in schools increases, there will be a growing emphasis on leadership by persons who understand the best uses for these educational tools; that is, those who know how to use the computer to best advantage for educational purposes rather than those who merely know how to operate a computer. As the courseware becomes more and more sophisticated, the nature of instruction is going to change. Thereafter, the nature of instructional leadership will also change. There are several possibilities for the directions that the changes will take. Let us explore several possibilities and make some conjectures as to what the consequences might be.

One possibility is that computers will handle all the routine parts of teaching: drill, practice, the giving of quizzes, presenting factual material, and keeping records of student aptitude and achievement. Because of their capacity to handle large amounts of data, computers will also be used for pilot testing and field testing new materials as the software is refined and expanded. In this scenario there will still be need for teachers to care for the human side of student development. There will be more emphasis on the affective and psychomotor domains of learning than there is at present, since the computer will be taking care of much of the cognitive development. Supervisors and other instructional leaders will be especially concerned with how teachers help students develop healthy self-concepts, attitudes, and values. There will be more individual interaction between teachers and students. Hence, supervisors will observe pairs rather than classrooms.

In another scenario, which presupposes the development of "expert systems" and artificial intelligence, computers will handle far more of the total instructional load. Such things as teaching problem-solving, the development of concepts, the development of inductive approaches to teaching will also be within the purview of the computer. Here the instruction will be computer-managed, whereas in the first example instruction was computer-assisted.

A third scenario would have computers equipped with video disks providing all the instruction. The human employees might still fetch and carry or, as one writer has suggested, be kept as pets by the computers-in-charge. The instructional leadership would be at IBM, Apple, or perhaps Time/Life. Perhaps one corporation would specialize in didactic instruction, another in heuristic; or they could rally round certain schools of thought:

behaviorism, humanism, conservatism, or various religions. There would no doubt be an electronic McGuffy reader for those who prefer the "old ways" best. One can even foresee special private schools that would emphasize *really* old ways and perhaps eliminate computers altogether from their methodology.

Other Administrators

Administrators other than principals can be a source of instructional leadership. Vice principals can perform any of the functions we have discussed. Administrators in the central offices of larger school districts often have skills for working with teachers and could benefit from spending time in the schools, but they tend to become isolated and desk-bound. Subject matter supervisors for large school districts may visit classrooms, give demonstration lessons, choose or recommend curriculum materials, and provide inservice training. In these and other ways they interact directly with teachers about the instructional program.

Supplementary Resources

Whoever the instructional leader is will make use of information from a variety of sources. Often the task of instructional leadership becomes more manageable if the leader will take advantage of these resources at his or her disposal.

Students can supply useful data for the feedback process. Questionnaires can be used to tap their perceptions, and interviews with them can provide a rich source of information. They can be used to operate videotape cameras for teachers who are undertaking self-analysis.

Self-analysis has not had the amount of use that it deserves. Parsons, in the 1960s, developed guides that can be used to analyze one's own videotapes. Minicourses--self-instructional units for teachers who want to develop new skills--use self-analysis of videotapes guided by a teacher's handbook as the feedback phase of a demonstration-practice strategy. They have been very successful in helping teachers to change their classroom behavior.

Support groups are a logical solution to the isolation and loneliness of teachers trapped in their classrooms. The development of quality circles in industry is being duplicated in school settings. One of the qualities of effective instructional leadership is the provision of psychological support (even therapy in some cases) to teachers who are facing a multitude of stresses. A healthy setting for dealing with these stresses is with one's peers.

Referrals are sometimes necessary. The therapy of a support group or the help of a sensitive leader may not be enough. A physician, psychiatrist, or other specialist may be called for. Another kind of referral takes place when a principal places a teacher on a "plan of assistance" or "intensive evaluation." Here the goal is not only to encourage growth but to remedy a serious deficiency. The use of others is advisable: having been the one to put the teacher on notice, the principal's potential to help may be reduced. Because these cases sometimes end in dismissal, the principal needs the support of others.

Plans of assistance might call for the forming of a committee to monitor the teacher's progress. The committee could include a neutral administrator, a teacher to serve as advocate for the teacher receiving assistance, and a person with special skill or understanding of the problem being addressed. The committee should meet regularly and keep informed of the teacher's progress.

A New Role for the Principal

The courts, arbitrators, and hearing panels regard the principal as the person most responsible for making judgments in respect to the evaluation of teachers. In some jurisdictions the superintendent is responsible by laws or regulation for teacher evaluation, but he or she may delegate the responsibility to others, usually principals.

As we have pointed out, the principal has a difficult task being the evaluator of teachers and also a clinical supervisor in the collegial, constructively critical mode we have advocated. We know some principals who are able to carry out both functions and maintain a high level of trust and mutual respect with their teachers. Their competence in the techniques of clinical supervision is a major source of this respect and trust. Despite the encouragement that such principals provide, they remain a minority. The majority of teachers do not feel they are getting the kind of supervision they want and need.

Two responses to the existing situation are needed. First, more principals should be trained and given experience in systematic observation and feedback techniques. When they have become skilled, their evaluation activities can provide useful information for the improvement of instruction. These evaluation activities can be a part of instructional leadership rather than empty ritual. Second, principals need to share the instructional leadership of the school with teachers and others who are taking on new roles in the instructional program.

The principal will have a new role to play in managing the logistics to make collegial observation and analysis possible.

Another role may be to provide inservice training or staff development activities that enable teachers to develop the skills necessary to become effective colleagues in a program that uses peer observation and analysis. Another role for the principal will be to work with probationary teachers (those who have not attained tenure) or with teachers who would prefer not to work with peers.

In addition to the new roles, the principal will still have the old role of summative evaluator. In most districts this responsibility will require (or imply) at least two observations in a year in which a teacher is being formally evaluated. For many schools that many observations will represent a quantum leap. Our information from several parts of the world (about how often teachers are observed by their evaluators) substantiates our rash claim that most teachers are rarely observed, and, when they are, the feedback from the observer is not regarded as helpful. Hence, being in the classroom as a skilled observer for either formative or summative purposes represents a new role for many principals.*

Another necessary role is to monitor and encourage the peer observation process. Even though teachers who have participated in such programs are enthusiastic about their beneficial effects, the number of competing events in a school calendar can intrude on and diminish the effectiveness of the process (which needs to be consistently pursued.)

* For principals who feel maligned by our skepticism, let us admit that we do not have data on *all* principals, or even *most*, but if the few thousands we have met or the several thousands whose teachers have responded to our surveys are representative, then we feel justified in stating that *many* principals do not treat instructional leadership as their prime concern, except in response to questionnaires.

Conclusion

For a number of years we have pondered the plight of the typical principal who must play the double role of supervisor and evaluator. We have tried to say and write things that would help make the situation more tolerable. Probably the best solution to this dilemma is to train teachers to observe one another and to provide feedback for formative purposes as part of the staff development program. Formal evaluation for summative purposes--retention decisions, promotion, tenure--would still be the responsibility of administrators.

The assignment of instructional leadership responsibilities to additional personnel in the schools will require support at the policy level, administrative cooperation, special training, and some hard work on the part of the individuals who will fill these new roles. Whatever these new roles are called, the functions, skills, and knowledge that we have described are prerequisite to the success of the new roles for instructional leaders.

References

Blumberg, Arthur. *Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War.* Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1974.

Broudy, H.S. "Didactics, Heuristics, and Philetics." *Educational Theory*, 22 (Summer 1972), pp. 251-261.

Joyce, B.R.; and Showers, B. "The Coaching of Teaching," *Educational Leadership*, 40 (October 1982), pp. 4-10.

Showers, Beverly. "Teachers Coaching Teachers," *Educational Leadership*," 42 (April 1985), pp. 43-48.

OSSC GOVERNING BOARD

Jean Fagnan, School Board Member, Reedsport SD 105
Charles Wiltse, Superintendent, Baker SD 5
George Benson, Superintendent, Centennial SD
Lee Christiansen, Washington ESD
Philip K. Piele, Executive Secretary, Oregon School Study Council
Ralph C. Rands, Associate Professor, Division of Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon
Milt Baum, Associate Superintendent of School Management Service Division, State Department of Education
Betty Knight, School Board Member, Oregon School Boards Association

OSSC STAFF

Philip K. Piele, Executive Secretary
Stuart C. Smith, Editor
Mary Cihak Jensen, Patrick J. O'Connor, Graduate Research Assistants